

AIGC

Integrated Working Overview

From institutional governance to runtime enforcement, contextual authority and human capability

PURPOSE	A living map of the ideas, structures, decisions and unresolved questions currently developing across AIGC discussions and working streams.
IMPORTANT	This document is a working synthesis. It does not treat every discussion contribution as an adopted AIGC position. Formal decisions, proposals, emerging synthesis and open questions are deliberately separated.

The central question

How can AI governance remain legitimate across different legal, cultural and institutional contexts while still becoming executable at machine speed? The work now emerging across AIGC suggests that this cannot be answered by policy alone. It requires an institutional layer, a contextual layer, a runtime layer, an evidence layer and a human capability layer that can interact without collapsing into a single global authority.

1. How to read this document

AIGC is currently developing several pieces of the same larger problem in parallel. Some discussions concern constitutional authority inside the organisation, others concern onboarding and operations, others test runtime governance for AI agents, and still others focus on sovereignty, culture, education and human capability. Read separately, they can look like disconnected initiatives. Read together, a coherent systems problem begins to appear.

Status language used throughout

Status	Meaning
Established / operational	A structure, role, process or direction that is already in use or has been explicitly set.
Proposed / under discussion	A concrete suggestion or architecture that has been put forward but is not yet a common AIGC position.
Emerging synthesis	A pattern that becomes visible when several AIGC discussions are viewed together. It is analytical, not automatically institutional.
Open question	A matter that still requires explicit resolution, testing or authority assignment.

The map at a glance

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE	Who holds authority, for what class of decision, and under which voting rule?
OPERATING SYSTEM / PROCESSOS	How people, applications, roles, Working Groups, tasks and hand-offs are operationalised.
WORKING GROUP ARCHITECTURE	Where focused work happens and how provenance between independently developed approaches is preserved.
RUNTIME AND AGENTIC GOVERNANCE	How authority, capability, permission, state and intervention are validated at execution time.
CONTEXT, SOVEREIGNTY AND POLICY STATE	How rules become applicable only within a valid legal, cultural and institutional context.

EVIDENCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY	How an executed action and resulting state change can later be proven and attributed.
HUMAN CAPABILITY AND EDUCATION	How governance becomes usable through skills, institutions, learning systems and national capability.

2. Institutional governance: authority before voting

One of the clearest developments is that AIGC must distinguish two questions that are often mixed together: who is authorised to decide a class of matter, and what threshold applies when that authority is collective. A debate about 66%, 75% or any other voting threshold is premature if the underlying authority model has not first been chosen.

UNDER DISCUSSION	A founder-led model, a Council-authority model for defined institutional matters, and a possible exceptional membership authority for constitutional questions represent different governance architectures, not different percentages of the same architecture.
------------------	--

This creates a useful design principle for AIGC itself and, more broadly, for AI governance: authority should be typed before it is quantified. The system first needs decision classes - operational, policy, constitutional, delegated, emergency and similar - and only then can it define who holds authority and which threshold applies.

Current organisational frame

The current operating picture includes a General Membership of roughly 220 people and a Policy Council of 19, with three Working Groups each intended to develop around a Chair, two Co-Chairs and a focused working membership. Named operational roles discussed around ProcessOS include Founder/Data Owner, Head of Processes, Head of Compliance and a learning/education responsibility, while finance remains centrally held for the time being. The important point is less the names than the emerging separation of institutional roles.

OPEN QUESTION	Which decisions are recommendations to the Founder/Chair, which become binding Council decisions, which can be delegated, and whether any exceptional constitutional matters belong to a defined membership authority.
---------------	--

3. ProcessOS and organisational execution

The ProcessOS work addresses a different layer: not what AIGC believes, but how AIGC actually functions. The emerging flow begins with recruitment channels such as the website, LinkedIn, referrals and WhatsApp, moves through an application and Council review, and then into approval, rejection, Working Group matching and onboarding. This is governance as organisational state transition rather than as abstract policy.

OPERATIONAL DIRECTION	A curated “Apply to Join” path, a common application flow, Working Group preference, contribution preferences, availability and consent to share relevant application details with Working Group chairs are being aligned so applicants are not repeatedly asked for the same information.
-----------------------	--

The grievance loop is also important because it exposes where process authority ends and escalation authority begins. Likewise, the unresolved ownership of the welcome/greeter step shows why operational governance needs named owners: a process that exists only conceptually is not yet an executable process.

OPEN QUESTION

The welcome/greeter hand-off needs an explicit owner. Working Group names and topics must remain identical across the shared application and profile flow once finalised.

4. Working Groups: separation without isolation

The Working Group model is becoming the main mechanism for focused development. This is useful only if AIGC avoids two opposite errors: centralising every idea into one architecture too early, or allowing each Working Group to build an incompatible island. The better direction now visible is interoperability with provenance.

That principle became especially clear in discussion around VPR, HomeSelf research and CIE. Independently developed architectures should keep their own chronology and provenance. Where interoperability is useful, the value lies precisely in testing whether distinct systems can work together without rewriting their origins into a single story.

EMERGING PRINCIPLE	Global interoperability does not require global authorship, and shared governance infrastructure does not require a single source of authority.
--------------------	---

WG3 - Runtime, Agentic & Dynamic Governance

WG3 is taking shape as an empirical stress-test environment rather than a doctrine factory. The methodological direction is to observe behaviour, identify patterns, form hypotheses, propose candidate practices and then require validation. A “governance gap” should be demonstrated, not merely asserted.

WORKING HYPOTHESIS	Capability is not authority. Authority is not permission. Permission is not evidence that the resulting effect was legitimate. Runtime governance must therefore evaluate more than model competence or policy compliance.
--------------------	--

5. Runtime governance: from permission to executable action

The runtime discussions are where several previously separate ideas begin to converge. An AI system may technically be able to perform an action while lacking valid authority to do so. Even where authority exists, it may have changed between the moment of authorisation and the moment of execution. A governance system operating at machine speed must therefore ask whether capability, authority, permission and relevant state are still valid at the point of action.

This produces a stronger chain than conventional access control: Contextual State → Capability → Authority → Action → State Change → Consequence → Verification → Accountability → Revalidation. The critical word is state. Governance becomes dynamic when a permission that was valid at T0 can become invalid at T1 because the person, asset, mandate, jurisdiction or surrounding context changed.

OPEN DESIGN QUESTIONS	What is the decision layer and what is the governance layer? What counts as a material state change? How long is an authorisation window valid? When must authority be revalidated? Where does human intervention add legitimacy rather than merely delay execution?
-----------------------	--

A practical architecture may therefore require two distinct machine functions: systems that orchestrate or propose actions, and a separate governance function that validates whether the action is executable under the current state. That separation remains a working direction rather than a fixed AIGC architecture.

6. Context, sovereignty and the policy-state problem

A second major convergence concerns the danger of treating governance rules as globally applicable simply because they can be expressed in a common technical language. AIGC can create shared terminology, comparison mechanisms and interoperable infrastructure without creating a common authority over different legal, cultural and institutional environments.

This is where the contextual-state argument becomes important. Before a rule can be applied, the system needs to know which fact pattern is relevant and which rule space is applicable in the current jurisdictional and cultural state. The stronger reasoning sequence is therefore: Contextual State → Relevant Fact Pattern → Applicable Rule Space → Subsumption → Decision → Contextual Revalidation.

**EMERGING
SYNTHESIS**

The missing layer is not simply “more policy”. It is a Policy-State or contextual applicability layer that determines which authority and rule set are valid here, now and for this object or action.

This also frames the sovereignty debate. Data, infrastructure, knowledge and decision power can be globally connected without becoming globally governed. The distinction between a common language and a common authority is therefore becoming foundational: interoperability can be global while authority remains locally legitimate.

7. Evidence, state change and accountability

Governance cannot stop at the moment a decision is made. If an AI agent acts, the system eventually needs to answer what actually changed, who or what had valid authority at that time, what the prior state was, what the resulting state became, and whether the transition can be independently evidenced.

This is the point at which provenance, verification and audit become more than documentation. They become part of the governance loop. A future evidence layer would not claim to create authority; it would prove the authority state and the state transition under which an action occurred. This distinction matters because governance and evidence are complementary but not identical functions.

EMERGING
SYNTHESIS

Capability → Authority → Action → State Change → Verification → Accountability provides a bridge between runtime governance and post-action evidence.

8. Human capability is infrastructure

AIGC discussions increasingly point beyond technical controls. Human-in-the-loop cannot be reduced to a red emergency button, because governance depends on whether people and institutions can understand, challenge and redirect machine-supported decisions. Human agency therefore has to remain present throughout the system rather than appearing only when automation fails.

The education and national capability discussions extend this further. Universities, training systems and national programmes are not side projects to governance; they determine whether a society has the capability to use AI on its own terms. Individualised learning, guided reflection, changing curricular structures and practical capability development all become part of the governance environment because they shape who can meaningfully exercise authority.

EMERGING
SYNTHESIS

People are not external to AI infrastructure. Human capability, institutional competence and education are part of the infrastructure through which governance becomes real.

This also links national capability work to sovereignty. A country that depends entirely on external models, external infrastructure, external expertise and external rule interpretation may have formal legal sovereignty while lacking operational AI sovereignty.

9. The emerging integrated architecture

When the current strands are placed together, AIGC does not yet have one finished framework - but a larger architecture is becoming visible. It is best understood as a sequence of validity checks and state transitions rather than as a single rulebook.

Step	Layer	Core question
1	Contextual State	What legal, cultural, institutional and object state exists now?
2	Relevant Fact Pattern	Which facts matter for this action

		or decision?
3	Applicable Rule / Policy Space	Which rules and authorities are valid in this context?
4	Capability	Can the person, model or agent technically perform the action?
5	Authority	Is it authorised to do so, by whom, and for how long?
6	Governance Evaluation	Do constraints, permissions and current state permit execution?
7	Decision / Executable Action	What action is allowed to proceed?
8	Material State Change	What changed as a result?
9	Verification / Provenance	Can the transition and authority state be evidenced?
10	Accountability	Who is responsible for the action and consequence?
11	Contextual Revalidation	Does the new state alter what becomes valid next?

IMPORTANT

This sequence is an emerging synthesis of multiple discussions. It should be treated as a map for continued testing, not as a formally adopted AIGC framework.

10. What remains unresolved

The value of a working overview is not only to show convergence but to preserve disagreement before it is prematurely flattened. The following questions remain central to the next phase of AIGC work.

INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY	Which decision classes belong to Founder/Chair, Policy Council, delegated roles or an exceptional membership process?
VOTING	Which thresholds apply only after authority has been assigned?
RUNTIME BOUNDARY	Where does model reasoning end and governance enforcement begin?
MATERIALITY	Which state changes are important enough to trigger revalidation, evidence or human intervention?
AUTHORITY LIFETIME	How is the validity window of a mandate or permission represented and rechecked?
LOCAL LEGITIMACY	How can shared AIGC structures remain interoperable without becoming a global normative authority?
PROVENANCE	How are independently developed architectures connected without losing authorship and chronology?
HUMAN ROLE	Where is a person required, where is human-on-the-loop sufficient, and where can machine governance operate autonomously?
EVIDENCE	What must be recorded so that actions and state transitions remain independently auditable?
OPERATIONAL OWNERSHIP	Who owns unresolved organisational hand-offs such as welcome, onboarding and process escalation?

11. Direction for the next update

Future versions should not simply add more text. Each update should record what changed in the system map: which open question became a decision, which proposal gained or lost support, which Working Group produced evidence, which operational role became owned, and whether new discussions alter the integrated architecture. The document should therefore evolve like a state record rather than a newsletter.

The publication discipline is equally important. AIGC can publish a living overview precisely because it distinguishes facts from interpretation. Where a formal AIGC decision exists, it should be named as such. Where an individual or Working Group has proposed an approach, provenance should remain visible. Where this document connects ideas across discussions, that connection should remain labelled as synthesis until AIGC explicitly adopts it.

Version record

Version	Date	Scope
0.1	7 October 2026	Initial integrated synthesis across institutional governance, ProcessOS, Working Groups, runtime governance, contextual policy-state, evidence/accountability and human capability.

Publication note

This working overview is designed for periodic republication. It intentionally remains concise enough to orient members and partners while preserving the unresolved questions that must still be answered through AIGC process and Working Group evidence.

12. Update register | 7 October 2026

Delta from v0.1. This register records new developments without restating the established architecture. Items are attributed as proposals, working arrangements or open questions; none should be interpreted as a formally adopted AIGC-wide standard unless explicitly confirmed.

12.1 Operational separation: information, rights and authority

Emerging clarification | Mikael's A02/A05 discussion

Information Governance and Rights & Authority should be separate domains. Access to information does not itself establish rights to reuse, publish, license or commercialise it; nor does it confer authority to represent AIGC or bind another party. Operational implication: permissions, rights provenance and decision mandates need distinct records and checks.

12.2 Platform trial and organisational boundaries

Working arrangement | Council discussion, 6 October

A two-week Circle trial was discussed while WG1 and WG3 continue on WhatsApp. Working Group chairs retain operational discretion. Platform choice does not settle legal ownership, confidentiality, intellectual property, membership status or voting powers. These require separate decisions.

12.3 Application-to-welcome handoff

Proposed process refinement | Cynda, 7 October

Application consent to share relevant details with Working Group chairs should be optional. The shortened profile should request WG preference, contribution preferences, availability and consent without duplicating the full application. Chairs are due to confirm common WG names/topics by 8 October, 18:00 UTC, so both forms can use the same vocabulary. The post-approval welcome/greeter step needs an accountable owner; Juha's greeter rota was mentioned, but ownership remains to be confirmed by Shakeel.

12.4 Context is nested, dynamic and multidimensional

Emerging synthesis | Sandra / New Zealand example, 7 October

The applicable governance context is not one country-level cultural tag. A person may occupy overlapping personal, family, community, organisational, professional, health-system and parliamentary contexts, each with changing relevant norms and obligations. A contextual-state model must therefore represent nested scopes, conflicts, transitions and revalidation rather than loading a single static cultural plug-in.

12.5 Integrity as a bridge from principles to trustworthiness

Hypothesis | Sandra, 7 October

Morality, social acceptance, ethics, normative frameworks and law are connected but not interchangeable. Integrity adds the practical question whether actors apply their stated principles under difficult conditions

and without observation. Hypothesis for testing: principles and applicable rules, combined with demonstrated integrity, contribute to trustworthiness; this is not a mathematical identity or an adopted governance rule.

12.6 Legal entity and authority boundaries

Open work | Thomas / Council

A comparison of global nonprofit structures is being prepared. The existence of a Pakistan company does not by itself determine the international AIGC legal structure, ownership, signing authority or jurisdictional governance. Keep institutional governance separate from national programmes and commercial engagements.

12.7 Implementation workstream and national partnerships

Boundary to preserve | Pakistan discussions

The AIGC/Shakeel governance and network track and Ammar Jaffri/CIT implementation track should not be conflated. National capability hubs, education pilots and any commercial advisory or activation engagements require explicit scope, contracting party, funding, IP and reporting boundaries before being represented as AIGC commitments.

12.8 Next decision register

Actionable open questions

Confirm owner for welcome/greeter step; receive final WG naming list; specify Circle trial success criteria and data/IP safeguards; classify A02/A05 authority versus information rights; establish authority classes and decision thresholds; obtain Thomas's entity comparison; define contextual state nesting and integrity evidence; identify the owner and due date for each item.

Publication note

This document is an independent working synthesis of ongoing AIGC discussions, not an official resolution or approved policy. Names indicate the origin of contributions, not endorsement of this compilation. Future editions should maintain a dated delta register and record decisions only with an identifiable decision authority and source.

Version 0.3 | 9 October 2026

Publication and The AIGC Forge: moving from internal synthesis to a visible knowledge process

Update status

According to the latest internal discussion, Shakeel proposed publishing the integrated working paper, and the previous version received positive feedback from participants. This is a **publication direction supported in discussion**, not evidence of a formal Council approval of every substantive claim in the paper.

What changes in the operating model

The AIGC Forge is envisaged as the public-facing place where ideas are made inspectable, compared, challenged and refined. Rather than waiting for a single definitive framework, the Corridor can release successive working versions, each preserving its provenance, editorial status and open questions. Publication becomes part of governance learning rather than a claim of final consensus.

Proposed publication lifecycle

Working synthesis → **editorial review** → **publication in The Forge** → **member response and domain review** → **revision / change log** → **Council consideration where needed**. The editorial publication decision must remain distinct from formal institutional endorsement. Public visibility is not equivalent to Council approval.

Editorial and authority safeguards

Every release should carry a version number, date, named editorial responsibility, status label, scope note and a clear distinction between established structures, individual proposals, analytical synthesis and unresolved matters. Corrections and disagreements should be recorded rather than silently overwritten. The Forge should display a short summary alongside the full PDF and an explicit review or feedback path.

New items to integrate in the ongoing synthesis

Institutional authority: clarify who may publish a discussion draft, who may mark a paper Council Approved, and which roles may edit metadata or upload contributions. **Forge workflow:** support a submission form with structured title, author, topic, abstract, PDF and review status; keep contributor submission separate from membership applications. **Operational ownership:** assign ongoing website/content upkeep and SEO to a small team rather than one individual, subject to agreed mandates. **Runtime WG3:** preserve the distinction among runtime validation, authority validation and provenance validation as an emerging test architecture, not a formally adopted standard.

Decision register | 9 October 2026

Item	Present reading / next step
Publication direction	Positive discussion feedback; proceed with staged release subject to editorial authorization.
The Forge	Proposed publication and review channel; define moderation and approval rights.

Item	Present reading / next step
Council approval	Not implied by publishing a working paper; separate status and decision process required.
Future versions	Publish incremental releases with dated change logs and unresolved questions.

Next release discipline

Each subsequent version should state: what changed, what was validated, what remains contested, what requires an authority decision, and what can now be tested in practice. This addendum updates the publication model without retroactively changing the substantive status of claims in version 0.2.

Version 0.4 | Consolidated update

9 October 2026 · Addendum to the Integrated Working Overview v0.3

Scope and provenance

This release preserves the full v0.3 baseline and records only additional clarifications grounded in the current AIGC working discussions. It does not certify Council decisions or independent verification of statements made in group discussions.

01 The Forge: practical contribution and publication flow

A simplified contribution path has emerged: contributors enter the title, author, topic and short description directly into a Forge web form and upload the PDF for review. These structured fields can become the publication metadata and public abstract after editorial acceptance. Contributors do not need Council-area access or an editor account merely to submit a paper.

The submission queue must remain separate from applications to join AIGC. A contributor submission is a request for editorial review, not a membership request, institutional endorsement or authorization to publish immediately.

02 Editorial permissions and authority separation

The current single-role dropdown does not adequately model a Council member who also performs editorial work. A robust design distinguishes institutional role (for example Council membership) from permissions (submit, review, edit, publish, mark Council Approved). Technical access must not itself confer constitutional decision authority. Approval to publish a Discussion Draft and formal Council approval are different actions, with different evidence requirements.

03 Website operations and shared responsibility

Shakeel proposed a committee working under Jörg's guidance to maintain the website, content and SEO, rather than placing the entire operational burden on one person. Nasser Qazi was mentioned in connection with near-term website work. Committee composition, mandate, access privileges and approval rights remain to be defined; the suggestion should not be recorded as an appointed committee.

04 WG3: executable stress-test concept

The emerging practical test separates an action-producing agent or orchestration layer from a governance-validation function. A candidate validation taxonomy is: runtime validation (current execution conditions), authority validation (mandate and permission in the current context), and provenance validation (origin and evidentiary trace). The precise fourth or additional class remains open. VPR/CIE may serve as a concrete interoperability case while retaining distinct provenance and architecture histories.

05 Release and review discipline

The Forge is intended to show successive development, not a sequence of final declarations. Shakeel's publication suggestion and favorable feedback on the earlier paper support staged release as a working direction. Each version should show status, date, version, editorial owner, concise change log, open questions and a review route. Publication alone does not mean Council Approved.

Decision / validation register

Item	Current status	Next required action
Forge form + PDF	Proposed workflow	Specify review queue, fields, spam controls
Contributor vs member	Design separation	Keep distinct request types
Council + editor	Permission gap identified	Implement multi-permission model
Publication approval	Not formally established	Define authorized publisher and audit
Website committee	Shakeel proposal	Confirm owner, mandate and members
WG3 validation classes	Emerging test concept	Agree test case, validators and evidence

Publication status: Working synthesis / Discussion Draft. Not Council Approved. Previous pages retain their original historical version labels; this addendum constitutes v0.4.